



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

08/922,263

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/922,263	09/02/97	CROWLEY	R BSC011

08/922,263 09/02/97 CROWLEY

R BSC011

021323 QM22/0418
TESTA, HURWITZ & THIBEAULT, LLP
HIGH STREET TOWER
125 HIGH STREET
BOSTON MA 02110

EXAMINER

SHAY, D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3739	29

DATE MAILED: 04/18/01

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr. Steven(3) David Shay(2) Mr. Duane Ww

(4)

Date of Interview April 12, 2001Type: Telephonic Personal (copy is given to applicant applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: Yes No If yes, brief description:Agreement was reached. was not reached.Claim(s) discussed: 54 (newly submitted)Identification of prior art discussed: Champelan, Vona et al, Takayama et al

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argued that in as much as one having ordinary skill was aware that the claims of Takayama et al produced sonoluminescence one would not ^{use it since} Vona et al teach that U.V. and soft X-rays produced thereby can be harmful. The examiner disagreed, noting the writing uses of U.V. (for corneal regeneration) and X rays (for diagnosis) in the medical field. Applicant noted that Takaya et al was for a particular purpose and would not be combined w/ Champelan et al. The examiner disagreed. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary. A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.